



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,552	11/13/2001	Rajagopalan Srinivasan	NUS-14	6759
7590	11/18/2003		EXAMINER	
Pandiscio & Pandiscio 470 Totten Pond Road Waltham, MA 02451-1914			MILLER, CRAIG S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/008,532	Applicant(s)	Pradeep et al.
Examiner	Craig Steven M. /k	Group Art Unit	2857

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on

29 September 2003

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-27

is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other _____

Office Action Summary

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:
 - I. Claims 1-15, 26 and 27, classified in class 702, subclass 183, drawn to process mode analysis.
 - II. Claims 16, classified in class 702, subclass 188, drawn to process supervision.
 - III. Claims 17-19 and 21-25, classified in class 702, subclass 185, drawn to state identification.
 - IV. Claim 20, classified in class 702, subclass 187, drawn to process history logging.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of groups II and I are related as combination and sub-combination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the sub-combination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed clearly does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed and the sub-combination has separate and distinct use, specifically with non-process control systems.

Inventions of groups I and III are related as combination and sub-combination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the sub-combination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed clearly does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed and the sub-combination has separate and distinct use, specifically with non-process control systems.

Inventions of groups I and IV are related as combination and sub-combination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the sub-combination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed clearly does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed and the sub-

combination has separate and distinct use, specifically for generating a knowledge-base for process monitoring without abnormality analysis.

Inventions of groups II and III are related as combination and sub-combination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the sub-combination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed clearly does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed and the sub-combination has separate and distinct use, specifically with non-process control systems.

Inventions II and IV are related as combination and sub-combination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the sub-combination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed clearly does not require the particulars of the sub-combination as claimed and the sub-combination has separate and distinct use, specifically with non-process control systems.

Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as using theoretically generated mode data.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Serial No. 10/008,552
Tech. Center 2857

-4-

5. Because of the complexities of the issues at hand, no phone call to applicant requesting an election was made.

6. Upon cursory review of the specification, the Examiner notes that the Abstract of the Disclosure is not submitted upon a single page.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Craig Steven Miller whose telephone number is (703) 305-9730. Art unit facsimile services are now available at (703) 308-7722.

The Examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Friday from 07:30am-4:00pm EST. Should repeated attempts to reach the Examiner be unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Marc Hoff may be reached at (703) 308-1677.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Craig Steven Miller
14 November 2003


MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800